UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/541,168	06/29/2005	Christopher A Brumm	3161-315	4386	
20202	30565 7590 01/24/2007 WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARTY, MCNETT & HENRY LLP			EXAMINER	
111 MONUME	111 MONUMENT CIRCLE, SUITE 3700		PRAKASAM, RAMYA G		
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-5137		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3651		
				1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
31.0	AVS	01/24/2007	PAPFR		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/541,168	BRUMM, CHRISTOPHER A				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ramya G. Prakasam	3651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE = Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versiling to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ju	ıne 2005.					
	action is non-final.	·				
·=	, 					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	•					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
	· -					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		Evaminar				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	= ' '					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority 	s have been received. s have been received in Application fity documents have been receive	on No				
application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , ,	d.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite				

Art Unit: 3651

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-7, drawn to a method for conveying a product wherein the product is lifted by rollers, classified in class 198, subclass 370.09.
 - II. Claims 8-27, drawn to an apparatus for conveying a product, classified in class198, subclass 779.
 - III. Claims 28-36, drawn to a roller for a conveyor, classified in class 193, subclass37.
 - IV. Claims 37-39, drawn to a method for conveying a product wherein the product is stopped and the roller shafts are translated under the product, classified in class 198, subclass 370.03.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method can be used by another and materially different apparatus that does not contain a static member having a top surface, a plurality of lobes placed circumferentially around the outer surface of each roller, or an angular offset between each lobe.
- 3. Inventions I and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another

and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the method can be used by another and materially different roller that does not contain an outer diameter including at least two lobes and less than nine lobes.

- 4. Inventions I and IV are directed to related methods for conveying a product. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are not capable of use together because Invention IV conveys the product by translating the roller shafts, and Invention I conveys the product by rotation of the rollers. Furthermore, there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.
- 5. Inventions II and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because Invention II does not require a roller having an outer diameter including at least two lobes and less than nine lobes. The subcombination has separate utility such as being used by another apparatus that conveys a product.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found

Art Unit: 3651

allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Page 4

- 6. Inventions II and IV are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the method can be used by another and materially different apparatus that does not contain a static member having a top surface, a plurality of lobes placed circumferentially around the outer surface of each roller, or an angular offset between each lobe.
- 7. Inventions III and IV are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method can be used by another and materially different roller that does not contain an outer diameter including at least two lobes and less than nine lobes.
- 8. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the

Art Unit: 3651

inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

9. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramya G. Prakasam whose telephone number is (571) 272-6011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 8:30am-7pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Crawford can be reached on (571) 272-6911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3651

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

1/22/2007 RGP

SUPERVISORY TYTENT EXAMINER